

REMARKS

Claims 3 and 4 are under examination, claims 1, 2, and 5-12 having been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled herein. Claims 13-18 have been added. The subject matter of claim 4 has been incorporated into new claim 16. Support for new claims 13-16 is found in cancelled claim 4, and at page 4, lines 5-8, page 11, lines 26-30, and page 12, lines 5-26, of the specification as filed. Support for new claim 17 is found at page 12, lines 5-16 and at page 12, line 27 to page 13, line 3. Support for new claim 18 is found at page 13, lines 4-12.

Claim 4 is allowable

Examiner has stated that claim 4, which depends from claim 3, is allowable if written in independent form. Claim 4 has been canceled and is rewritten as new claim 16. Claim 16 recites an antibody comprising a heavy chain and a light chain, wherein said heavy chain comprises an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:3 and said light chain comprises an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:4.

New claim 13 recites an antibody comprising heavy and light chains with at least 80% sequence homologies, respectively, to SEQ ID NOS:3 and 4. New claim 14 recites the antibody of claim 13, wherein the antibody has rabies virus neutralizing activity. New claim 15 recites an antibody of claim 14 comprising heavy and light chains with at least 90% sequence homologies, respectively, to SEQ ID NOS:3 and 4. New claim 17 recites the antibody of claim 16, wherein the antibody comprises fragments selected from the group consisting of Fv, Fab, and F(ab')₂ fragments. New claim 18 recites the antibody of claim 17, wherein the antibody is an IgG1 antibody. Each of the elements recited in the new claims is supported in the specification as filed, as more fully detailed above.

New claims 13-18 are free of the art asserted against canceled dependent claim 4.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection

Claim 3 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Rando et al. (Curr. Top. Microbiol. Immunol., 1994, 187:195), Ikematsu et al. (J. Immunol., 1993, 150:1325), Muller et al. (J. Virol. Methods, 1997, 67:221), and Cheung et al. (J. Virol., 1992, 66:6714). Although not necessarily

Reply to Office Action dated September 9, 2003

agreeing with the reasoning of the Examiner, claim 3 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection as to this claim is now moot.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, new claims 13-18 are believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action toward that end is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DOUGLAS C. HOOPER, et al.

By



DANIEL A. MONACO
Registration No. 30,480
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
One Logan Square
18th and Cherry Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19103-6996
(215) 988-3312 - Phone
(215) 988-2757 - Fax
Attorney for the Applicants